

the attention of the House, this is an uneconomic and unproductive sort of operation, but it is not even consistent, I would remind the gentleman, because these galleries extend in one area, and apparently they only cover the male employees. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEGGETT. That is true.

Mr. COHELAN. So in terms of employee surveillance it is apparently inconsistent. I wonder if the gentleman can tell the House how many female employees there are in our modern post offices.

Mr. LEGGETT. This, of course, is a subject which we will pursue, if we can get this matter to a hearing before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I have talked to members of the committee and I am sure they want to hear about it; perhaps not in the 88th Congress, but certainly in the first part of the 89th Congress.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as I leave this evening, I want to commend the gentleman from California and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I trust the gentleman has personally carried his criticisms to the Postmaster General, Mr. Gronouski; but, on second thought, I suspect he would have a difficult time locating Postmaster General Gronouski these days because he is too busy out castigating Republicans and particularly what he pleases to call Republican extremists. I imagine the gentleman would have a difficult time finding him in his office. He is too busy campaigning.

As one member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I would be most happy, if I am returned to Congress next year, to have the gentleman from California before the committee and others before the committee to provide us with their criticisms and maybe by that time the campaign will be over and if the Democrats are in control, Mr. Gronouski can return to the business of operating the Post Office Department instead of traveling through the country castigating Republicans.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure Mr. Gronouski would be doing the thing that he thinks most important. I think, however, the Post Office is in good hands. I am satisfied that they are upholding the law and carrying out the system in the most economical way possible, delivering some 70 billion pieces of mail. Certainly I do not mean to be critical of the 448,000 post office employees or the Postmaster General himself. However, sometimes we get harassed with certain procedures the antiquity of which we really cannot recognize.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from California has brought this subject to the attention of the House. About 4 years ago when I first brought up this subject my office was literally flooded with mail from postal workers who were very exercised against the operation of these peepholes. One of the main criticisms is contained in this letter, in which a postal worker from a town in Rhode Island indicated that "this practice is an insult to the dignity of one of Uncle Sam's postal workers." And that I think holds true for all of the some half million postal workers, both clerks and letter carriers.

I do not believe that these peepholes accomplish anything which good supervision could not cure. I believe that it is a very healthy thing to have a full-scale investigation of this by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I caught correctly the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] a minute ago that perhaps Mr. Gronouski would be around with us next year. I thought I caught the suggestion in what the gentleman from Iowa said, that Mr. Gronouski would be around to assist in that investigation in 1965. I appreciate the suggestion and the confidence of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I would be pleased to yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I made no suggestion such as that of having Mr. Gronouski around next year. I think this situation can be cured only if we have a change in the administration.

Mr. LEGGETT. I might point out that we are not being partisan at all in our current attitude with reference to the post office, this particular part of the post office system, because if you look back in the record I think you will find that our colleague, Mr. HECHLER from West Virginia, carried on this attack under the Eisenhower administration.

And, I believe, whomever the Postmaster General may have been at that time likewise failed to heed the suggestion made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield further to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, certain improvements have been made by the Post Office Department. I talked with the Chief Postal Inspector, Mr. Henry Montague, and it is true now that these lookout galleries are not installed in post offices employing less than 20 employees.

In addition to that, the cost has been reduced somewhat. I commend Mr. Montague for his work.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from California and I share the feeling of many other Members that it is the principle of the operation which could stand some improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEG-

GETT], and I trust that this investigation may proceed in the new Congress to such an extent that we may be able to install an adequate system of supervision that will insure the dignity of the great number of postal employees.

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I just have a few more remarks that I would like to insert into the Record.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, is the system foolproof, the existing system of peepholes? I believe that we know that it is not. Thefts, of course, still go on in the postal system.

Mr. Speaker, if an employee is going to steal, why not do it out on the route, or better, with the old cliché, the hand is quicker than the eye, apples as well in the postal system as it does on the stage.

Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, the peepholes only cover 80 percent of the working room in a post office.

Is there an alternative method to decrease crime in the post office?

Mr. Speaker, I hope no one gets the idea that I am against or for crime in the postal system. Certainly, I believe any crime should be detected in the easiest and best possible way. But obviously over a period of years the best possible method of handling theft is through the baited-letter system, which is a system that uses marked bills, as well as a number of other facilities which clearly and cogently catches the offender but catches him in a fair way. However, this is not done through snooping and other methods such as that.

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

VIETNAM AND THE CONGO— ANOTHER RED COUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, no official of the present administration seems able to explain why the incident in the Gulf of Tonkin was provoked by the North Vietnamese. To all outward appearances, there was no justification for this unprovoked action. It appears to be even more inexplicable to administration officials because there seems to have been no Communist followup in that area of the world.

For my part, I cannot look at Communist-inspired incidents as isolated, or unrelated to other events, or without purpose.

Let us recall that in 1948, while all eyes were on the Berlin airlift, decisive battles were lost which led to the fall of China.

This is not an unusual Communist tactic.

Today, in 1964, while all eyes were on the Gulf of Tonkin, another decisive action was taken by the Communists, this time in the Congo. Stanleyville, a strategic key to the whole Congo area, is now firmly in Communist hands.

Mr. Speaker, so as to underscore the seriousness of this situation, it has just come to my attention from a usually reliable source that Communists are shipping in Migs and Ilyushin aircraft to Stanleyville.

Mr. Speaker, when will this administration realize that Communist strategy is global strategy, that one incident in one part of the world is almost always related to other incidents in other parts of the world, that President Johnson's proud boast that we have not one but 120 foreign policies is a grave deficiency that will prevent this administration from understanding what the Communist strategy is all about?

Mr. Speaker, it is time to develop one meaningful and coordinated American foreign policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. HALPERN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

END OF AN ERA

(Mr. CORMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, mentioned that tomorrow we may take action which will be necessary if we are to prevent the end of an era. I suggest to you that tomorrow will see the end of an era one way or the other. For one thing, if we take up the matter at all, we will see the end of an era in this House in which we have some respect for our legislative committees. The Committee on the Judiciary was in the middle of hearings on an extremely complex subject, attempting to bring to this House some advice on what we ought to do concerning the proposed bills to block reapportionment of State legislatures. We had heard some 30 Members of Congress over a period of about 3 weeks, and 23 additional Members were waiting their turn to be heard. Also waiting to testify were a great number of public witnesses. At this point, after a hearing which lasted less than 2 hours on one day, the Committee on Rules took the matter from the Committee on the Judiciary and reported it out of that committee.

If we take up the resolution tomorrow and consider the Tuck bill, we will have abandoned our traditional procedures in the House. The legislative committees of the House will be degraded. If the Committee on Rules can report bills directly to the floor in this manner, of what use are the legislative committees?

Mr. Speaker, assuming we take some action tomorrow, whatever it may be, we will see the end of an era.

If we refuse to take up the Tuck bill and show that we support the Supreme Court decision on reapportionment, we will see the end of the era of control of State government by rural minorities and

special-interest groups. Now that end is one which appeals to a great number of people in this country and I hope in this Congress.

If on the other hand we act to deny the plaintiffs in the various reapportionment cases the relief which has been granted to them by the Supreme Court, if we deny the Federal courts the power to rule on constitutional rights and thus deny each American citizen protection of his constitutional rights in the Federal courts, then we will see an end of a system which has served this country well for nearly 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is any issue which will come before the Congress in this decade which is of such importance and such far-reaching effect as that action which is proposed on tomorrow.

I sincerely hope all of the Members will be here and participate in the discussion, and after due reflection, decide that each American citizen is entitled to the kind of protection he can presently get in the courts of this land.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] for today, be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCCLORY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. POOL (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH), for August 18 and 19, 1964, on account of illness.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. PINNIE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. SMITH of California (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending

Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 30 minutes, on August 19.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 30 minutes, on August 19.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 30 minutes, on August 19.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 15 minutes, on August 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and to include an article on Mr. Hoover.

Mr. BONNER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in five instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in five instances.

Mr. FASCELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEROUNIAN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LINDSAY in five instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROMWELL immediately preceding Mr. KEOGH on conference report on H.R. 1839.

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. HECHLER) to extend his remarks immediately following the vote on H.R. 1839.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BECKER.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. MOORE in three instances.

Mr. FINBLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HECHLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. RYAN of New York.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. POOL.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. EVINS in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows: